

THE CALL



TO THE COLORS

Organ of the METHODIST LEAGUE FOR FAITH AND LIFE

Vol. I

PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY, 1925

No. 2

Our Second Issue

THE second issue of THE CALL TO THE COLORS, the monthly organ of the Methodist League for Faith and Life, contains some very interesting news and some very valuable articles.

To start with, we are able to carry the first of a series of articles by Professor Faulkner, of Drew Theological Seminary. His contribution this month opens up the most interesting discussion: What are the earliest creedal expressions of the Church? Professor Faulkner finds several creedal beginnings in the New Testament, itself, and in addition a comparatively complete creedal outline. The next of his articles will review the earliest extra-Biblical creeds giving their probable dates.

There is no more widely read scholar in American Protestantism than Professor Leander S. Keyser, of the Lutheran Divinity School at Springfield, Ohio. Dr. Keyser holds the chair of Systematic Theology. He has prepared for us this week a most valuable bibliography of scholarly works that buttress faith.

Dr. McKinney's exposé of a most common Modernist blunder ought to give those brethren pause in their boast of science and scholarship. Men who cannot read as plain a writer as John Wesley carefully enough not to make him seem to say the exact opposite of what he actually did say are not to be relied upon in their scholarly findings. Who knows but they have muddled here also? Wesley speaks of positions identical with Modernism as "The Spawn of Hell," and the Modernists quote a disconnected phrase from this very context to support their positions. The writer has heard this misquotation in more than a score of Modernist speeches. Read Dr. McKinney and help to silence the thing.

Another interesting Modernist muddle is the editorial from the Wisconsin *Christian Advocate*, quoted herein. Dr. Fosdick quotes with approval a New York paper to the effect that Fundamentalists are lacking in charity and that Modernists are lacking in clarity. We agree with him at least in part.

Dr. Carlisle Hubbard's article, "A Passion for Souls," is an appeal to recover the basis for evangelism by a pastor who is really making a success of evangelism year after year. To him Modernism is not an academic question. He sees it as vital and practical.

Mr. Haddon, the treasurer of the League, reports its growth during the month. He notices the addition of seventeen conferences to the number

of those in which the League has membership. Significant is the fact that Vermont and Rock River are included among them. The League has made a start also in the Theological schools.

The paragraphs upon the Course of Study situation appearing this month are the first of a series of discussions setting forth the exact facts in this most amazing situation.

We hope to publish next month an article by Dr. Clarence True Wilson and another by Dr. Charles M. Boswell. Dr. Boswell will write an account of a wonderful Methodist revival meeting held in down town Philadelphia twenty-five years ago.

Are There Creeds in the New Testament?

By JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER

IF WE take the time covered by the authorship or writing of the New Testament as say roughly A.D. fifty to eighty-five or ninety (years of mighty expansion of Christianity over eastern Asia and Europe), it is evident that the needs of missionary preaching in that foundation era would demand brief statements of faith, items of belief and of conduct, creeds (Latin, *credo*, I believe). For the first question asked of any apostle of a new religion is, What do you teach? What do you believe? What do you ask us to hold? What must we give up of our old faith, what receive as new? Continental scholars have gone into this with characteristic thoroughness, notably Prof. Alfred Seeberg in his *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, Leipzig, 1903, and without indorsing all that he says it will be interesting to see some facts in this field.

We have the striking passage in Rom. 6:17: "Thanks be to God that whereas ye were slaves of sin, ye obeyed from heart that pattern (lit., type, *tupon*) of teaching unto which ye were delivered." (Translations mine.) Here there was a regular line of marked out instruction which the converts in Rome were held to, and from the context it is evident that it was in this case moral rather than doctrinal. You will remember that the General Rules of the United Society, which Wesley drew up in seventeen hundred and forty-three, and which, when I was pastor, had to be read once a year to the Church, were almost entirely ethical, being in this respect an unconscious imitation of that *tupos* or sketch or mould of teaching spoken of by Paul which was held of so much importance that it was not only delivered to the Christians, but the Christians were handed over to it (to use the remarkable expression of the apostle). I do not suppose they took an actual pledge or oath to this creed of conduct, but it was no light thing in Christianity.

Another striking passage is 1 Cor. 4:17, where Paul is speaking of his methods or ways (would you call him the first Methodist?) as preacher, evangelist, sufferer, etc. (read verses 6-21: use Am. Standard Revision). He beseeches them, he says, to be imitators of him. "For this cause I have sent unto you Timothy, who is my loved (the word is strong) and faithful begotten-child in the Lord, who shall cause you to remember those

Ways of me, yes, those Ways in Christ, even as I teach everywhere in every Church." Notice Paul does not say the Ways of mine which I live, my behaviour, but those Ways *which I teach*, which shows that Timothy is to bring up those doctrines (things taught) which Paul gave forth on morals, life, spirit, etc.

What was the content of this moral creed? It was the avoidance of those very sins which were most common in the pagan world in which Christians lived, fornication, covetousness, drunkenness, etc. To bring them home to the conscience Paul gives numerous catalogues of these sins, and he generally closes his epistles with ethical warnings, not simply in general terms, but with particular mention of actual evils and deviltries.

But the creed did not stop at morals. It included things to be believed. Take the famous utterance in 1 Cor. 15.1ff. "I would have you know, brothers, the Gospel which I gospelized to you, which also you received, and in fact in which you stand, through which also you are saved, if you hold firmly with that word I gospelized to you, unless you believed in vain. For I gave over to you first what also I received that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he arose on the day the third according to the Scriptures, that he was seen with the eyes by Peter (the first meaning of the word *orao*, it has others), afterwards by the twelve," etc. Here we have six items of a definite confession of faith which Paul did not make up himself, but with which he was definitely put in trust, and which he definitely handed over to the believers, apparently without increase or decrease. If we could put it positively it might read: I. We believe that Christ died (that is, his death was not seeming, as ancient opponents and some modern radicals hold, but real). II. We believe that that death was for our sins (not for our virtues as an example, not for our lives as moral influence, not for our teaching to show us God's love, of which we were already convinced, but that he was bruised for our transgressions and that he bore our sorrows and sins, not simply as faithful to his calling). III. We believe that this death thus motived as atoning offering for sin is according to the Scriptures (as part of the eternal plan of God as revealed in our sacred writings). IV. We believe that he was buried (not hid for purposes of deception later, but regularly buried according to Isa. 53.93). V. We believe that this Christ arose from the dead on the third day, also according to the Scripture (yes, this Christ as thus dead and buried arose in the same body in which he died, and on a certain day, not before and not after, according to his eternal purpose, and thus not to be seen as a ghost at any time after death, but to be seen in body on the third day and not till then). VI. We believe that this Christ thus risen was actually seen by his disciples (and that repeatedly, so that the disciples had no doubt and could have no doubt of the reality—not of the fact that he lived with God at the moment of his death and might be manifested like any departed, as ghost, which they already fully believed as belonging in a general way to the Pharisaic party, but—of his bodily resurrection, and so of the fulfilment of his promises, the conquest of his enemies, and the pouring of a deathless faith into his

disciples, and as giving an opportunity for those last instructions which could be imparted only after his resurrection).

And this is the Six Article creed not of Paul so much as of the whole Christian Church, which he received, which he faithfully handed on, which he preached (not simply the social and economic questions of the time, like slavery), in which and by which alone the Christians stand (not by fine doctrines like God is love, that those who obey Him shall be saved, etc., which they had believed all along), and on which, he also says, their salvation depends. According to Paul, this was the Gospel, not his alone, but the Christian community's. "Whether then I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed" (ver. 11).

Were there other elements? Alfred Seeberg makes the point (p. 59) that the solemn and formal way in which Paul in Gal. 4.4 mentions the incarnation, that (1) it occurred in the fullness of time and only then, (2) it was the deliberate sending by God not of the highest angel but of his Son, (3) that this Son came apparently not by help of a father, but as being sent as the pre-existent Son of God was "born" only of the "woman," (4) that the purpose of the sending was not moral influence or preaching beautiful things or revealing God's love (all of which they had in the Old Testament) but was redemption, and (5) that the further purpose of the redemption was to make Christians sons of God by adoption, with the result of the sending of the Spirit of that Son into the hearts of the adopted sons. But the main point is the sending of the Son, spoken of as though it were a formula of a universal confession of faith by Christians. This then might be called the Seventh Article of the primitive creed: We believe that God the Father sent his Son into the World.

Equally striking is the solemn and formal way in which Paul (and not Paul only, for see James 1.1, 1 Pet. 1.3, and in Heb. 1) brings the Father and Son or God and Christ in one row, not mentioning one without the other, doing it so frequently as to be almost incidental and unconscious, and yet so deliberately as to be formal and stereotyped as though it were a regular confession of the whole community which Paul received with the other items mentioned. This collocation of Jesus with God which we have as though it were a matter of course in the very first epistle Paul wrote (1 Thess. 1.1) perhaps fifteen years after the Ascension—absolutely blasphemous if Christ were not reckoned under the category God—indicates a settled formula received everywhere and springing out of a universal Christian consciousness. Not only in the introduction to his epistles, but every once in a while in them, is this done. In one passage Paul justifies this placing of Christ as Lord alongside of the Father as God in cadences or verbal harmonies that suggest a creed or chant or oft-repeated confession:

There is one God, the Father,
Of whom are all things,
And we unto Him.
There is one Lord, Jesus Christ,
Through whom are all things,
And we through Him. (See 1 Cor. 8.6)

Was this recited or shouted aloud in the congregations? Anyway we have here Article Eight of a universally received creed: We believe in God the Father, the maker of all things, and in Jesus Christ his Son and our Lord, through whom all things are made.

I ought not to take more space in this number. But before I close let me say a word not on this subject but a related one, that is, on the New Testament calling Christ, God. There were two things that the sacred writers were anxious for: first, to distinguish Jesus from the Father who sent him and to whom he was subordinate as being sent and as being Son, and second, to place him within that ineffable mystery and radiance we call God. Connected with this was the fact that neither in Old nor New Testament was God a bare mathematical unit, a single unknown quantity x , but that while there was only one God this God had a rich and complex fullness of life. Even in the Old Testament there was distinguished in this divine life Father, Son and Spirit, and in the New more distinctly. So that the word God, though naturally applied mainly to the Father, can also be used on occasion for the other subsistences or so-called persons which Scripture, reason and Christian experience represent as sharing and mediating the life of God.

It will not be denied that the far more natural reading or spacing of the words of Rom. 9.5 is as the American Standard Revision gives in the text, viz., "whose (the Jews) are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever"; this rather than the margin, placing a semicolon after "flesh" and proceeding, "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever," rather a lame and commonplace ending for so masterly a penman as Paul. In spite of the long and able comment of H. A. W. Meyer, I still feel that the reference of "God" to Christ in Rom. 9.5 is the most natural, though the matter is not absolutely certain. Though he acknowledges that the New Testament teaches the absolute deity of Jesus, he is arbitrary in thinking that the doxologies to him as such in our New Testament are post-apostolic interpolations or additions. On the other hand even Ritschl frankly acknowledges (*Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 2 Aufl., p. 79) that Paul gives the name of God without hesitation to Christ, and though he does not do this often Ritschl adds that in giving Christ the standing designation Lord, Paul gives him the name over all names, and which designates nothing less than the name of God, and refers to 1 Cor. 12.3, Rom. 10.9, comp. Rev. 19.16, James 2.1. Christ is called Saviour in Tit. 1.4 and 3.6, and the context and wording of Tit. 1.3, 2.10 and 3.4 certainly suggest that "God our Saviour" there also means Christ. In Tit. 2.13 you can either translate, "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," or "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." But in either case the reference is to Christ and not to the Father, for no Christian looked for the appearing of the Father, but all Christians looked for the appearance of Jesus. That was their "blessed hope," and though their hope included many blessings, that and that alone was their "blessed hope."

A Passion for Souls

By REV. CARLISLE L. HUBBARD

IF THE spirit of the times has not robbed us of our faith it has unquestionably dampened our evangelistic zeal and killed in us that flaming passion for souls that once was the distinguishing mark of a Methodist Christian. That revival fires are not burning brightly upon the altars of our beloved Church is an evident fact. There was a day when the passion for souls nigh consumed us, when every Methodist Church glowed with the fires of evangelism, and when the cry from pulpit and pew was "Give me souls or I perish."

Upon what spiritual food did the Methodists of that day feed? Whence came their consuming passion? Perhaps we can discover the cause for the change that has come over us in a changed emphasis from our pulpits? When revival fires burned in our hearts and on our altars we were emphasizing great fundamental truths. What are we preaching now?

In those mighty days we preached about the sinner, that he was lost, and lost then. Lost in misery and hopeless despair. Lost as the sheep was lost that had strayed from the fold and lay bruised and bleeding in the midnight storm. Lost as the prodigal son was lost when he came to himself, hungry and in rags among the swine. Lost as the "scarlet" woman was lost when she lay at Jesus' feet, hurled there by her accusers. And LOST MEANT ETERNAL RUIN, a ruin so real, so terrible that one could hear the sob in the voice of Jesus as He warned men away from the place, "Where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

And we preached about Jesus; Jesus the Divine One; Jesus GOD AND MAN; JESUS DYING UPON THE CROSS TO MAKE ATONEMENT FOR THE SINS OF MEN. He was the sinners' substitute, the sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows. He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him and with His stripes we are healed."

And we preached Him not only crucified, dead and buried, but also risen, ascended, triumphant, leading His Church to victory over the world and sin by the might of His invisible but all empowering Holy Spirit.

This was the preaching of yesterday, and upon this spiritual food men thrived; souls grew mighty; a passion for the lost consumed men's hearts; the shout of spiritual victory was well nigh continuous.

But today this emphasis is largely changed. We still preach about the sinner and about Jesus, but in a greatly changed fashion.

To be a sinner is, today, little more than an inconvenience. It causes one to miss some fine fellowships, and some delightful experiences. One may be in danger of loss of reputation, or some things even worse than that, but all this will be repaired in the end by perfectly natural means. Sin is not a terror. Hell is not a reality.

And Jesus is merely a human being, DYING THE DEATH OF A MARTYR, and SETTING US AN EXAMPLE NOBLE AND FINE.

His divinity is the divinity to be found in all men, though perhaps he possessed more of the divine than the rest of us. There is something wonderful, but nothing supernatural about His birth, His life, His death and His resurrection. He is simply the best man that had lived until His day, and, strange to say, until this day. And he saves us, if we are saved at all, not by His blood, but by His example.

One scarcely needs to point out that such a Gospel cannot stir our souls to passionate zeal and sacrifice. Why bestir ourselves to save men from so small a danger as the merely human consequences of sin? Why be "crucified with Christ," if He is not God, dying for the sins of the world? There is no wonder the ardor of the Church has cooled. No wonder that its passion for souls is not found as in other days.

Is there hope for the future? Yes, let us come and sit at His feet again. "Who was in the beginning with God and Who was God." Let us go out into the dark night with Him as, with tear-dimmed eyes, rock-torn feet, and weary body, He seeks the poor, blundering, bleeding lost sheep. Let us follow Him as He staggers beneath the heavy burden of His cross, until we come with Him to Calvary, and watch Him as He hangs bleeding and dying for the sins of the whole world, and for our sins.

Let us come and stand with Mary in Joseph's garden and wonder with her as she sees Him, risen, and let us exulting cry with her Rabboni, "My Master"!

Let us climb the hilltop with His disciples and watch Him as He ascends. Let us strain our ears to catch the song of the angelic chorus when He is welcomed home. And then when we have seen and heard and felt these things let us remember His words of command: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Let us tarry for our Pentecost; and let us then GO FORTH.

Surely the fires will be rekindled upon the altars of our hearts. Surely there will be reborn in us and in our Churches a passion for souls that will send us out to a world of lost men to preach, a Divine, a crucified, a risen, a seeking Saviour. And the world will be brought to His feet.

Wilmington, Delaware

Amendments Submitted

The meeting of the League at Philadelphia on May 12th, ordered the following amendments submitted for action.

Amend Article IV on Membership by adding the following: Provided, however, an associate membership (not including the right to vote) may be accorded to a member of any Christian Church who signifies his or her acceptance of the Common Christian Creeds and who wishes to put the weight of his or her influence behind the avowed purposes of the League.

Amend Article VIII on Committees after the word officers in the second line as follows: and of such other members as may be elected by the League to this responsibility. *The article will then begin:* There shall be an Executive Committee composed of the officers and of such other members as may be elected by the League to this responsibility.

The Call to the Colors

Organ of the Methodist League for Faith and Life

Published Monthly by the Methodist League for Faith and Life in Philadelphia
Minimum Membership Fee of \$1.00 which Includes a
Year's Subscription to the Journal
Subscription Separate from Membership \$1.00 per Year. Single copies 10 Cents

Editor, HAROLD PAUL SLOAN

Some Things Methodists Should Know About the Course of Study

THE course of study is providing the training for about three thousand Methodist ministers every quadrennium. What these young men are taught is what you have a right to expect them to preach in the pulpits of Methodism.

The educational value of the course of study has been greatly improved during the past eight years. This fact may not, however, be an unmixed gain to the Church. If it is teaching TRUTH, then the better the teaching the better the fruitage. If it is teaching UNTRUTH, then the better the teaching the greater the peril.

What is the course of study teaching Methodist preachers? Do you know that a committee of twenty men made a careful investigation of this question, and took their findings in person to the Board of Bishops at Atlantic City last November? Here are a few facts about the way in which they did their work.

1. Every book criticised was reviewed by at least two members of the committee.

2. When these reviewers reported all the texts under consideration were before the committee, and the references in each instance were looked up.

3. The findings of the committee were in every instance unanimous.

4. The criticisms of the committee were supported in the Board of Bishops by a very considerable vote.

5. In one instance the criticism was sustained, one of the destructive books being excluded by the Bishops.

6. In three other instances the vote was almost a tie; it being eight and nine to twelve and thirteen.

7. When six, eight, nine and seventeen of the Bishops agree with the criticisms of a responsible committee and vote to sustain their findings it is time the Church took the situation seriously.

Here are some of the teachings of the criticised books put in a brief sententious way. The facts can be had in full detail by anyone who will take the trouble to read carefully a few pages.

1. The course of study is teaching Methodist ministers to regard Jesus as an errant figure, who did not know, who repeatedly made mistakes.

2. The course of study is teaching Methodist ministers that Justification by Faith (the corner stone of Paul's Gospel, and also of the Reformation, and of Wesley's

Revival) is not a universally applicable principle of salvation, that it applies only to some men, and is inapplicable to others.

3. The course of study is teaching Methodist ministers to repudiate the objective atonement of Christ. The very word is represented as undesirable, and its familiar meaning is repeatedly both denied and ridiculed.

4. The course of study represents the New Testament as unreliable, even as a record of the words and teachings of Jesus. The disciples, it is asserted, very probably wrote into these teachings ideas of their own.

5. The course of study is teaching men that the Gospel preached in the Churches through the centuries does not represent the true mind of Jesus, but is instead the resultant of a number of influences.

6. The course of study is teaching men to question the New Testament records concerning the Virgin Birth and Resurrection Appearances of Jesus.

7. The course of study is teaching men that the wonderful records in John's Gospel of the mind of Jesus is not the writing of an immediate auditor, John the apostle, but rather of some more remote personality who wrote under the influence of some other mind than Jesus' own, namely St. Paul, and who incorporated traditions into his tale.

8. The course of study teaches men to disregard the united testimony of the four evangelists, that Jesus understood throughout his earthly ministry that he was going at last to die on the cross for the sins of the world. It pictures Him, instead, as going to Jerusalem, even at the last, in bewildered uncertainty, anticipating his death there, but not clearly understanding its meaning.

9. The course of study teaches men to deny supernatural prevision in the prophets of Israel. The prophets were merely world statesmen writing from a moral and spiritual point of view.

10. The course of study, in a word, presents to Methodist ministers a Gospel constantly at variance with that which is defined and established in the doctrinal standards of the Church, and it is doing this in direct defiance of the specific order of the General Conference twice given, once in 1920, and once in 1924, that only such books as are in full and hearty accord with our constitutionally established standards shall be included among its textbooks.

These facts have been before the Church since 1922, when they were published in detail with full citations, book and page. No one has undertaken to deny them. The official attitude has been to ignore them. The writer sought an interview with two of the most influential persons connected with the Course of Study interest. It was granted. Some of these facts were brought out, and the reply of those brethren was, in substance: If the facts are as you say, it is serious, but we do not know whether they are. Three years, then, after the facts had been published, two men, prominent in this interest, still did not know whether a responsible criticism was accurate or not. Brethren who are not big enough to give courteous and careful consideration to a responsible criticism are not the kind of men to be trusted with large responsibilities in a democracy; and if Methodism is not a democracy it is high time it was made one.

Is the Church Dividing?

(An Editorial from the Wisconsin *Christian Advocate*)

WE ARE publishing almost in full an editorial from the Wisconsin *Christian Advocate*. It appeared in the issue of February, 1924. It is a striking illustration either of the editor's lack of information or else of his unwillingness accurately to face and state the facts of the present controversy. We quote:

"In these days we have what are known as Fundamentalists and Modernists, but are not both of them preaching Christ and is not the person of Jesus the Alpha and Omega in all their discourses? Would Brother Corr intimate that these two classes were preaching a different religion? We hope not. We believe he has more charity.

"The matters on which these good people differ are not vital matters in any sense. They are not essentials. To fight about things which men hold by faith only, is foolish always. Such conduct reminds us of the two knights that Phillips Brooks tells about, in the time of Charles V. They were invited to settle upon the battle-field their disputes about the doctrine of the immaculate conception. We do not know which party slew the other, but it did not settle the dispute. All the world knows that. Who wants to go back to these barbaric days?

"And yet what a furor is being raised in some quarters in regard to this same virgin birth. Some people do not believe that Christ was divine because of His birth, but believe in the account of His birth, because He was divine.

"Some are free to say that the deity of Christ does not depend upon the method of His entry into the world, but they do not deny the deity, nevertheless. Who shall decide where doctors disagree? Why, therefore, denounce one another because we do not see those great mysteries in exactly the same light? Why charge one another with heterodoxy or why indulge in heresy trials, which only breed bitterness and strife and have never in all history revealed any new truth or permanently settled any controversy whatsoever?

"Why not rather confine ourselves to the practical application of the teachings of Jesus to the every day life of mankind? For after all this is what this old world needs, more than anything else.

"What is there to be gained by all this controversy about things which do not and should not affect one's loyalty to Jesus Christ or the living of a Christian life? What difference does it make if Brother Corr should say he is a Fundamentalist and this editor should say that he is a Modernist? Are we not both staking our whole life on the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Are we not both doing our utmost to bring in His kingdom?

"Why then quarrel about words or definitions or things that happened centuries ago? What difference does it make if this editor should profess to be a dichotomist while Brother Corr insists perhaps that he is a trichotomist? Would this prevent us from holding a revival meeting together? Not at all. Then why insist upon drawing these lines? Why lay all this stress upon matters that are purely intellectual? Why persist in wounding Christ in the house of His friends? Why compel all men to think or feel alike? Why not recognize one another's liberty? Why not rather concentrate our strength and energy upon the transformation of human life and ushering in a new world in which righteousness shall dwell, whose motto everywhere shall be "In essentials, unity—in non-essentials, liberty—in all things, charity."

"Therefore, beloved, we must conclude as we did before by saying that *we refuse to divide—refuse to be stamped in either direction.*

"We do not have to be either Fundamentalist or Modernist, for the most excellent reason that we are Methodist."

Now notice the editor makes it a question of a minister's charity whether he estimates that Fundamentalism and Modernism are different religions. We would point out that it is not a question of charity, but a question of fact, and that the editor of the *Philadelphia North American* (a daily newspaper) the editor of the *Christian Century* (a Modernist paper), J. Gresham Machen (an evangelical professor) and Kirsopp Lake (a Modernist professor) are all agreed that the two points of view are practically two religions.

Again the editor says that the issues are not upon vital matters in any sense. We would inquire if the resurrection of Jesus is not vital, and if it is not vital whether Christ died a propitiatory sacrifice for sin as the Church has believed for two millenniums or whether his death was simply that of a loyal personality like that of a soldier on the battle front or of a doctor in an epidemic?

He tells a ridiculous story about two knights fighting over the immaculate conception, and asks whether we want to return to such days. We reply that intellectual sincerity does not make necessary physical encounters; but that perjury at the altars of the Church is more distressing even than the effort to settle issues with the sword.

In the next paragraph he sets forth that the current issue is one concerning the immaculate conception. Here he is entirely mistaken. Protestantism has never asserted the immaculate conception. This is a Roman doctrine and entirely different from the Virgin Birth. The Virgin Birth was believed from the beginning. The immaculate conception was declared by the Vatican Counsel in 1870.

Then he justifies men in denying the Virgin Birth of Jesus. But we reply: They pledged themselves to this truth at their ordination, as well as at their baptism. Common sincerity is violated by such conduct, and only a Jesuitical or muddled mind can justify it. He says, "Who will decide, where doctors disagree?" But the fact is that the Virgin Birth of Jesus is not being decided. It has been affirmed from the beginning. Doctors can only disagree by stultifying themselves.

He suggests confining oneself to the practical application of the teachings of Jesus. But to assume that this is the whole Gospel is to assume that Christianity has been wrong for two thousand years, and that Modernism is right. This is precisely the question at issue within the Church. Evangelical Christianity stresses the person and redeeming work of Christ, and makes Justification by Faith its central preaching. Modernism repudiates the whole of Christianity with the exception of the ethical teachings of Jesus. The editor must either be sadly uninformed as to the actual content and drive of Christian truth or else he must be trying to muddle the rest of us.

He then tries to make the contest ridiculous by the distinction between dichotomy and trichotomy. With such shallow befogging of issues one can hardly write with patience. Neither dichotomy nor trichotomy has ever been formulated or defined in Methodism or so far as the writer knows in Protestantism. It is not confessed in any of the common creeds, it is not an issue before the Church. The very meaning of the words is largely unknown, and, if we mistake not, it was this obscurity that caused the author to select them. Such a method of argumentation is certainly lacking in candor, and one might almost say in sincerity.

Finally the author says he is not a Fundamentalist or a Modernist because he is a Methodist. But the facts are again against him. No man can be a Methodist with intellectual sincerity without believing in the outline of truth affirmed and established in the constitution of Methodism. This outline of truth includes: The triunity of God; the incarnation of the Son by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; the personality of the Holy Ghost; the bodily resurrection of Jesus on the third day; His ascension into heaven, and His return at the last to judge the quick and the dead; the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus; justification by faith; the authority of the Bible as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice;

and the fall and universal human depravity as the tragic occasion for the whole. This outline of truth is almost exactly the confession of Fundamentalism and is repudiated at almost every point by Modernism.

We conclude with this sentence: "I came not to bring peace but a sword." We will not attempt a lengthy exegesis of this passage. We simply affirm that an honest contest is more acceptable to God than a dishonest and insincere peace.

Modernist Misquotations

By REV. THOMPSON W. MCKINNEY

THE Modernist group have for years practised a very serious misstatement of facts with respect to Mr. Wesley. We like to think that this misstatement is due to carelessness and ignorance on their part, for we would not like to think that brethren possessing the information would so grossly misrepresent the facts. The quotations in question are Mr. Wesley's two sentences: "We may think and let think" and "Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart? If it be, give me thy hand."

In quoting these words to gain the weight of Mr. Wesley's name for their loose thinking the Modernists are doubtless simply quoting each other, and no one of them can have stopped to look up the sentences, for in their context they repudiate the very position they are quoted to sustain.

Let us give one instance of the Modernist usage and then examine the passages.

The circumstance occurred in a city not far from Philadelphia. A Methodist minister, who occupies one of the leading pulpits of his conference, on a certain Monday morning recently, addressed his ministerial brethren on, "Some Aspects of Modernism." From the modernistic viewpoint the paper was very good. The rhetoric was fine and there was an abundance of words. I am to be pardoned if I say that continually running through my mind was this descriptive phrase, "Full of sound and fury, meaning nothing." There was an absence of argument, but the presence of the usual stock of assertions. He required that we believe what he no doubt believed, namely, that all who hold to the historic faith of the Church are possessed of "static," or "fossilized" minds, and are quite unable to make any progress toward the new truth. Having made these assertions he then with an air of great seriousness and finality, made the familiar misquotation of John Wesley.

When the essayist had finished, a venerable minister arose and said, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Dr.—— through you, whether or not he believes in the Virgin Birth of our Lord?" But Dr.—— with a look of offended dignity, replied, "I refuse to answer."

Here we have the striking circumstance of a prominent Methodist minister clearly manifesting a lack of candor on a serious question, and at the same time defending himself by a misquotation of Mr. Wesley's words.

And now exactly what did Mr. Wesley mean when he used these oft-quoted words? Where were they used? What was their intent? On page

477 of Wesley's first volume of sermons, you will find the third division of his sermon, "On the Death of Mr. Whitefield." The interrogation which opens the third division of this valuable sermon is, "But how shall we improve this awful providence?" The answer is given: "And first, let us keep close to the grand Scriptural doctrines which he (Mr. Whitefield), everywhere declared. There are many doctrines of less essential nature, with regard to which, even the sincere children of God (such is the present weakness of human understanding), are and have been divided for many ages. In these we may think and let think; we may 'agree to disagree.' But meanwhile let us hold fast the essentials of 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints,' and which this champion of God so strongly insisted on at all times, and in all places."

Mr. Wesley then goes on to declare his faith in the whole outline of common Christianity. He says, "Whatever therefore God does, He does it merely for the sake of His well beloved Son. He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities.' He Himself 'bore our sins in his own body on the tree.' 'He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.' Here then is the sole meritorious cause of every blessing we do or can enjoy; in particular of our pardon and acceptance with God, of our full and free justification." He goes on, "And except a man be (thus) 'born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' " He concludes the matter by saying, "You are not ignorant of these fundamental doctrines which he everywhere insisted upon. And they may be summed up, as it were, in two words, the New Birth and Justification by Faith. These let us insist upon with all boldness at all times and in all places."

It is very clear that Mr. Wesley in using the phrase, "We think and let think," did not intend to allow loose thinking concerning the fundamental Christian doctrines. Indeed, the very opposite is true, and he says so very distinctly.

Now a moment with the other misquotation. It is found in a sermon on The Catholic Spirit, which begins on page 346, of volume one. Here, as in the other sermon, Mr. Wesley gives latitude only with respect to non-essentials such as forms and institutions of worship and not in matters of doctrine.

Leading up to the misquoted passage, which is on page 349, are these words: "I dare not therefore presume to impose my mode of worship on any other. I ask not therefore of him with whom I would unite in love, are you of my Church, of my congregation? Do you receive the same form of Church government, and allow the same Church officers with me? Do you join in the same form of prayer with which I worship God? * * * Let all these things stand by; we will talk of them at a more convenient season if need be. My only question at the present is this, 'Is thine heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?'

"But what is properly implied in the question? I do not mean, what did Jehu imply therein? But what should a follower of Christ understand thereby?"

Mr. Wesley then proceeds to ask a number of questions setting forth and insisting upon the very fundamentals of the faith which Modernists repudiate, and which they quote him as their warrant in repudiating. Here are some of them. He says, "Is thy heart right with my heart," means "Is thy heart right with God? * * * Dost thou believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, God over all, blessed forever? Is he revealed in thy soul? Dost thou know Jesus Christ and Him crucified? Does He dwell in thee and thee in Him? Is He formed in thy heart by faith? Having absolutely disclaimed all thy own works, thy own righteousness, hast thou submitted thyself to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ?"

Having enumerated these and some other familiar Christian doctrines Mr. Wesley continues, "I do not mean that you should embrace my modes of worship, or that I will embrace yours. * * * I believe the Episcopal form of Church government to be the Scriptural and apostolical. If you think the Presbyterian or Independent is better, think so still and act accordingly."

In the closing division of this sermon he points out that the Catholic Spirit "is not an indifference to all opinions," this he says "is the spawn of hell, and not the offspring of heaven." Again, "A man of a truly Catholic Spirit, has not now his religion to seek. He is fixed as the sun, in his judgment concerning the main branches of Christian doctrine."

Here is a rare bit of description to which, if the Modernists take heed, they will do well. "Observe this," says Wesley, "you who call yourselves men of Catholic Spirit only because you are of muddy understanding; because your mind is all in a mist; because you have no settled, consistent principles, but are for jumbling all opinions together. Be convinced that you have quite missed your way. You know not where you are. You think that you have the very spirit of Christ, when in fact you are nearer the spirit of antichrist. Go, first, and learn, the first elements of the Gospel of Christ, and then shall you learn to be of a truly Catholic Spirit."

Well done, Mr. Wesley. We thank you, and we affirm once more that every Modernist who uses these quotations to sustain his doctrinal vagaries publishes either his ignorance or something worse.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Books that Uphold the Faith

By LEANDER S. KEYSER, D.D.

IT AFFORDS me pleasure to furnish, at the editor's request, a list of books that stand firmly for "the faith once for all delivered." First, I shall go back a few years, and name a list of stalwart works which dealt most effectively with the rationalistic Biblical criticism of Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen and their followers in England and the United States. My purpose in naming them is two fold: First, to show that the plenary faith has had competent defenders all along since the rise of the radical criticism; second, to indicate that, if the Modernists had studied these scholarly rebuttals of the rationalistic contentions and mastered their contents and logic—well, they would not be Modernists; they would be evangelical believers. What amazes one is the constant repetition by the self-styled

advanced "scholars" of our day of radical statements that have been refuted again and again by evangelical scholars of the period from 1880 to 1910. I recommend the reading of the following older works:

James Robertson (Glasgow): "The Early Religion of Israel" (two volumes).
 Alfred Cave: "The Inspiration of the Old Testament, Inductively Considered."
 E. C. Bissell: "The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure."
 W. L. Baxter: "Sanctuary and Sacrifice."
 James Orr: "The Problem of the Old Testament."
 K. T. Keil: "Historico-Critical Introduction to the Old Testament" (translated from the German and published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh).
 C. A. Noesgen: "The New Testament and the Pentateuch."
 William H. Green: "Moses and the Prophets," "The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," "The Unity of the Book of Genesis."
 Samuel C. Bartlett: "The Veracity of the Hexateuch: A Defense of the Historical Character of the First Six Books of the Bible."
 R. H. McKim: "The Problem of the Pentateuch."
 J. W. McGarvey: "The Authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy" (a cogent work, dealing with a key position); "Short Essays on Biblical Criticism."

(Continued next month)

Acknowledgment of Subscriptions for Publication in the May Issue of "The Call"

NEW members of the Methodist League for Faith and Life are continually being added to its rolls from all sections of the country. The following conferences have been added to the list that was announced in the April number of *THE CALL*, making forty-six in all at this date: Vermont, Colorado, Central Swedish, North Carolina, St. Louis, New Mexico, West Virginia, Central Illinois, South Dakota, Central New York, Northwest Indiana, Virginia, Southwest Kansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, South Tennessee.

In the past few days subscriptions in various amounts, all of which are very helpful and for which the League and its officers express appreciation and thanks to each donor, have been received from the following:

J. Irving Taylor, Chester, Pa.; Rev. L. F. Green, Ellendale, North Dakota; Rev. Chas. C. Harris, Preston, Md.; Rev. Elwin L. Wilson, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. R. A. Anderson, Navesink, N. J.; Rev. Clarence F. French, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. Christian S. Jessen, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. John O. Mabuse, Morganville, N. J.; L. W. Thomas, Ashland, Ohio; Rev. C. H. Mayo, Mrs. C. H. Mayo, Chatham, La.; Rev. W. G. Mikkelson, Wimbleton, N. Dakota; Mrs. Mary E. Lamb, Andover, Ohio; Rev. H. Gail Grosdidier, Stafford, Kan.; Miss Evelyn H. Fisher, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. Harry W. Fowler, Rileyville, Va.; Mrs. Minnie B. Waits, W. La Fayette, Ind.; Paul H. Stewart, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Virgil E. Rorer, Indianapolis, Ind.; John D. Adair, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. W. G. Nixon, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Wm. J. Rule, Coupeville, Wash.; Mrs. C. H. Seal, Albright, W. Va.; Birtil Cale, Bruceton Mills, W. Va.; Rev. J. E. Johnson, Bruceton Mills, W. Va.; Fred Lenhart, Albright, W. Va.; Rev. W. R. Davis, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Harold Marcus Hilliard, Jasper, Mo.; Mrs. May Woodruff, Allendale, N. J.; Everett L. Stuart, Ashland, N. C.; Pearl Lynes, Wellington, Kan.; Rev. John C. Willits, St. Joseph, Mich.; Rev. Alonzo Bright, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Rev. J. J. Hoffmann, Chicago, Ill.; Frank P. Felton, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.; Chas. W. Wright, Jordan Mines, Va.; F. A. Stanger, Bridgeton, N. J.; A. S. Lyons, Chattanooga, Tenn.; D. R. Cruise, Woodstown, N. J.; Rev. O. L. Markman, Mt. Vernon, Ill.; Gosse B. deVries, Mrs. Gosse B. deVries, Glendale, W. Va.; Rev. George W. Yard, Atlantic City, N. J.; Chas. E. Schroeder, Atlantic City, N. J.; Rev. James F. Boughten, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. Carlton R. VanHook, Collingswood, N. J.; Rev. Wm. M. Young, Buffalo, N. Y.; Mrs. Emma Ne Collins, Racine, Wis.; Rev. Edmund M. Mills, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. J. S. Miller, Bowbells, N. Dakota; Mrs. J. H. Lowry, Smithfield, Ohio;

Rev. Roy N. Keiser, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Gwynn H. Keller, Glassboro, N. J.; R. Wallace Johns, Akron, Ohio; Richard J. Freeman, Philadelphia, Pa.; David Dailey, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Harry D. Mitchell, Asbury Park, N. J.; Rev. George A. Cooke, Frankford, Del.; Everett A. Tyler, Haddonfield, N. J.; Rev. E. L. Trotter, Irondale, Ohio; John W. Sparks, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. W. R. Wedderspoon, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. George H. Haigh, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. H. R. Wardell, Jacksonville, Ill.; George W. Crabbe, Baltimore, Md.; E. U. Sowers, Lebanon, Pa.; Mrs. Francis Helphinstine, Akron, Ohio; Rev. J. Mitchell Bennetts, Philadelphia, Pa.; J. S. Hughes, Philadelphia, Pa.; C. S. Mervive, Roxboro, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. L. P. Stevens, Chester, Pa.; Rev. W. L. Amthor, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Richard Radcliffe, Coatesville, Pa.; E. L. Quigley, Winfield, Kansas; Mrs. John Varner, Glen Dale, W. Va.

Brevities

One can appreciate the fact that Modernists do not realize the actual intellectual situation, for their practice has long been to ignore arguments they cannot answer. They talk much about doing their own thinking, but the great majority of them take their thinking ready made. They are traditionalists, only they prefer to believe new rather than old traditions.

Professor Arthur Holmes, Ph.D., of the Department of Psychology of the University of Pennsylvania; Professor William R. Newbold, of the Department of Philosophy in the same institution, and Professor K. D. Storgis, in the Department of Chemistry, must, however, all three be counted as unconvinced by the Modernist point of view, and there are hundreds more.

In Pittsburgh, Pa., on the fourth and fifth of April of this year, a group of evangelical students for the ministry from several of the northern Theological Seminaries got together to promote evangelical faith among seminary students. They adopted a constitution, and have sent it out for ratification to the student bodies generally. This is a significant move, and is certain to be fruitful. Those interested in it will address Rev. Walter Laetsch, 36 N. Albany St., Chicago, Ill. The name of this student organization is "League of Evangelical Students."

The paper of Allegheny College called *The Campus*, published at Meadville, Pa., under the date of April 1, 1925, carries a striking expression of modern negative opinion. The article deals with the Christian Easter festival. From the language one would infer that the consensus of opinion at Allegheny in this particular group rejects both the Godhood of Jesus, His atoning sacrifice and His resurrection on the third day. The article follows:

MEN'S BIBLE CLASS DISCUSSES SUBJECT OF MODERN EASTER

"Dr. Darling placed the subject of 'The Modern Easter' before the College Men's Bible Class for discussion, in Ford Chapel, last Sunday morning, March 29th. Each member of the class present gave his conception of the modern Easter. To most people, this day means more than any other holiday observed by the Church. Emphasis was placed by the early Christians upon the physical resurrection, but the modern conception places it upon the spiritual resurrection.

"The death of Christ means that he gave His all for the principles for which He stood. If Christ had died a natural death, people would probably not have observed the anniversary of it. Of all the Easter season, Good Friday is the most significant day because it marks the sacrifice of a human life for a principle. The spiritual rising of Christ was a resurrection of the ideals and principles which He sought to establish on earth. Because of this great modern conception, Easter is becoming of more importance to more people each year."

We cannot positively say to what extent the opinions here set forth reflect the purpose of the religious department at Allegheny; but we can be sure that there is some influential negative teaching in this Methodist school to produce such a definite Modernist opinion, and expressed, too, in such accurate Modernist language. The writer has been in several schools where no such opinion could find expression, let alone be the consensus of a men's Bible class group, and appear in the college paper. That it is the consensus, and did find full expression at Allegheny is therefore most significant. By the Higher Critical method there is warrant here for a very radical conclusion.